

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA**  
**SHREVEPORT DIVISION**

**RICHARD THOMAS WILLIAMS**

**CIVIL ACTION NO. 11-793-P**

**VERSUS**

**JUDGE FOOTE**

**STATE OF LOUISIANA, ET AL.**

**MAGISTRATE JUDGE HORNSBY**

**REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION**

In accordance with the standing order of this Court, this matter was referred to the undersigned Magistrate Judge for review, report and recommendation.

**STATEMENT OF CLAIM**

Before the Court is a civil rights complaint filed in forma pauperis by pro se plaintiff Richard Thomas Williams, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. This complaint was received and filed in this Court on May 10, 2011. Plaintiff names the State of Louisiana, Sheryl D. Dubose, the U.S. Marshal, and the Woman Advocate for Sheryl D. Dubose as defendants.

Plaintiff filed his civil rights complaint and IFP application. The Court then sent him a Memorandum Order granting his application to proceed in forma pauperis. However, that Memorandum Order was returned to this Court on June 27, 2011 by the United States Postal Service marked “RETURN TO SENDER -GONE.” To date, Plaintiff has not informed this Court of his new address.

All parties have the responsibility of promptly reporting to the Court and to all other

parties any change in the mailing address. Failure to do so shall be considered cause for dismissal for failure to prosecute. See ULLR 41.3W.

Accordingly;

**IT IS RECOMMENDED** that this complaint be **DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE**, sua sponte, for failure to prosecute, pursuant to Rule 41(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure as interpreted by the Court and under the Court's inherent power to control its own docket. See Link v. Wabash Railroad Company, 370 U.S. 626, 82 S.Ct. 1386 (1962); Rogers v. Kroger Company, 669 F.2d 317, 320-321 (5th Cir. 1983).

### **OBJECTIONS**

Under the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C) and Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b), parties aggrieved by this recommendation have fourteen (14) days from service of this Report and Recommendation to file specific, written objections with the Clerk of Court, unless an extension of time is granted under Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(b). A party may respond to another party's objections within ten (10) days after being served with a copy thereof. Counsel are directed to furnish a courtesy copy of any objections or responses to the District Judge at the time of filing.

A party's failure to file written objections to the proposed findings, conclusions and recommendation set forth above, within fourteen (14) days after being served with a copy shall bar that party, except upon grounds of plain error, from attacking, on appeal, the proposed factual findings and legal conclusions that were accepted by the district court and

that were not objected to by the aforementioned party. See Douglas v. U.S.A.A., 79 F.3d 1415 (5th Cir. 1996) (en banc).

**THUS DONE AND SIGNED**, in chambers, in Shreveport, Louisiana, on this 23<sup>rd</sup> day of October 2012.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
MARK L. HORNSBY  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE